



## Early Journal Content on JSTOR, Free to Anyone in the World

This article is one of nearly 500,000 scholarly works digitized and made freely available to everyone in the world by JSTOR.

Known as the Early Journal Content, this set of works include research articles, news, letters, and other writings published in more than 200 of the oldest leading academic journals. The works date from the mid-seventeenth to the early twentieth centuries.

We encourage people to read and share the Early Journal Content openly and to tell others that this resource exists. People may post this content online or redistribute in any way for non-commercial purposes.

Read more about Early Journal Content at <http://about.jstor.org/participate-jstor/individuals/early-journal-content>.

JSTOR is a digital library of academic journals, books, and primary source objects. JSTOR helps people discover, use, and build upon a wide range of content through a powerful research and teaching platform, and preserves this content for future generations. JSTOR is part of ITHAKA, a not-for-profit organization that also includes Ithaka S+R and Portico. For more information about JSTOR, please contact [support@jstor.org](mailto:support@jstor.org).

decreed respecting the canon of Scripture, writes thus—"The Hebrews reckon xxii books in all as authentic. They designate as apocryphal the books of Wisdom, Ecclesiasticus, Tobit, Judith, and Maccabees. The Church, however, receives the *Apocrypha* also as true, useful, and moral, although not valid for proof in controversy concerning matters of faith."\* More decidedly, if possible, in our favour, is the testimony of *Alphonsus Tostatus*, the contemporary of Antoninus, and who was regarded as the wonder of his age in learning of every kind. We will quote but one of the numerous passages to the same effect, which occur in his writings—"None of those apocryphal books (although it may be inserted amongst the other books of the Bible, and may be read in the Church) is of such authority as that the Church can argue from it to prove any truth; and so far forth as this she does not receive them. And in this sense Jerome is to be understood, when he says—The Church knows nothing of the Apocrypha."† We come next to *Cardinal Ximenes*, to whose piety and munificence we are indebted for one of the noblest monuments of human learning—The Complutensian Polyglott. In the preface to that work, the reader is specially informed that "the books outside the canon, which the Church receives rather for the edification of the people than to confirm the authority of ecclesiastical dogmas, are written in Greek only (not in Hebrew).‡ These books are enumerated—viz., Tobit, Judith, Wisdom, Ecclesiasticus, Maccabees, and the apocryphal additions to Esther and Daniel. Now, when we remember that the Complutensian Polyglott, preface and all, was published by the authority of Pope Leo X., to whom it was dedicated, we have a very striking proof that, at the commencement of the 16th century (A.D. 1517), at the very time when Luther commenced his opposition to Rome, neither the Pope nor the Church of Rome held the canonicity (in the strict sense of the word) of the Apocrypha, but regarded it in the same light as Jerome, whose very words, in reference to it, *Cardinal Ximenes* quotes in the passage above cited.

Another eminent witness on our side is the great *Erasmus*, who, in addition to his vast general learning, was the first Biblical scholar and critic of his age. In his explanation of the Apostle's Creed and the Decalogue, he proposes this very question, as to the number of Books contained in canonical Scripture, and he answers it by adducing the catalogue of *Rufinus* (of Aquileia, and a contemporary of Jerome), in which our apocryphal Books are expressly separated from the canonical, and designated by a distinct name—viz., *ecclesiastical*. Again, in his epistle to students of Scripture, prefixed to the 4th volume of his edition of Jerome's works, *Erasmus* says—"It certainly is of great moment to ascertain what the Church receives, and with what intention she does so; for, although she may attribute the same honour to the (22) Books of the Hebrews and the Gospels, she certainly does not mean that the same weight should be assigned to Judith, Tobit, and the Books of Wisdom as to the Pentateuch."§ What a striking prospective commentary on the decree of Trent, passed about sixteen years after, in which it was asserted that the Church always received the Apocrypha as of equal authority with the rest of the Bible!

*Cardinal Cajetan's* testimony we have already adduced in our last number. His works abound with statements of a similar kind. We will here quote two more, if possible stronger than that which has been referred to. One occurs in his commentary on the first chapter of the Epistle to the Hebrews—"We have adopted Jerome's rule to prevent us from error in the determination of the canonical Books; for we esteem as canonical those which he delivered as such, and those which he separated from the canonical Books we hold to be outside the canon."|| The other passage is found in the Dedicatorial Epistle to Pope Clement VII., prefixed to *Cajetan's* Commentaries on the Historical Books of the Old Testament. "Most blessed father," he writes, "the universal Latin Church is most deeply indebted to St. Jerome, not only on account of his annotations on the Scriptures, but also because he distinguished the canonical books from the non-canonical, inasmuch as he thereby freed us from the reproach of the Hebrews, who otherwise might say that we were forging for ourselves books

or parts of books belonging to the ancient canon, which they never received."\*\* *Cajetan's* work appeared but twelve years before the Council of Trent, and was dedicated, as we have just said, to Pope Clement VII., and received his approbation. Consequently, Jerome's rule, relative to the broad distinction between the canonical books (properly so called) and the apocryphal, was then recognised by the Roman Pontiff himself.

Such was the state of opinion respecting the canon of Scripture, among the greatest divines of the Western Church, and even some, at least, of the Roman Pontiffs, immediately prior to the Council of Trent. Disregarding, however, everything but the exigencies of the moment, that Council published, in 1546, its portentous decree, whereby it swept away the barrier which had existed for seventeen centuries between the canonical Scriptures of the Old Testament and the Apocrypha. The one great object of the Council was, to arrest, by every possible means, the reformation movement, and to sustain, by every available expedient, the corruptions in the doctrines and practices of the Western Church, which had been for many ages making silent but sure progress. The Reformers appealed to Scripture, and to it alone, as the arbiter of the points of dispute between them and the Church of Rome. The Tridentine Fathers, while they refused, and for a very plain reason, to rest everything on the decision of Scripture, alleging, as a co-ordinate authority, the traditions of the Church, yet were naturally anxious to have Scripture on their side as far as possible. With this view they enlarged the limits of canonical or inspired Scripture, admitting within its sacred pale the apocryphal writings, because from them they thought they might derive what they searched the canonical Scriptures for in vain—viz., some show of proof in support of such dogmas as purgatory, the worship of angels, and the atoning efficacy of alms-deeds.

The history of the manner in which the Tridentine decree in question was passed is highly instructive. In the "Congregations," or preliminary meetings, held prior to the fourth Session the question of the Canon of Holy Scripture was debated. Some of the divines recommended that the distinction made by Jerome, and approved by Pope Gregory, between the canonical and non-canonical books of the Old Testament, should be still maintained. Others were of opinion, that no distinction should be expressly stated, but that a general catalogue should be drawn out of all the books together, like that of the Council of Carthage, and nothing more said on the subject. Others, again, suggested that a threefold division should be made, the third class being composed of the books that had never been received as inspired by the Church—viz., the Apocrypha. A fourth party, the smallest in point of number, but the most zealous and energetic, proposed that the Apocrypha should be placed upon the same footing as the rest of Scripture, and an anathema pronounced against all who should dispute it. This opinion at last prevailed, and the famous Decree de *Canonicis Scripturis* was passed, in the fourth session, by some fifty bishops, of whom sixteen, at least, utterly dissented from it in reality, and merely acquiesced in the opinion of the majority. Such is the way in which this awful decree was passed, and such is the authority on which it rests. Fifty-three bishops, or rather thirty-seven, with a specific object in view, to the attainment of which they felt themselves constrained to make any sacrifices, assumed the privilege of raising to the rank of inspired Scripture books which hitherto had not only not been admitted within the sacred pale, but had been expressly excluded from it by many of the greatest Fathers and Doctors of the Church.†

We have, then, on the one side, this decree, passed by the men, and in the manner just described. We have, upon the other side, the authority of our Blessed Lord and his inspired apostles; we have the undisputed authority of the Church of God, Jewish and Christian, during a period of seventeen centuries; we have the deliberate opinions of the greatest Fathers and Doctors down to the very time when the Council of Trent was assembled; we have all the reformed Churches of Western Christendom, and the whole orthodox Eastern Church from the remotest times to the present hour. We are willing to take our stand upon this side; we accept, as regards the Old Testament, the canon of the Jews, notwithstanding the contemptuous epithet of "the canon of the Scribes and Pharisees," with which some of our

opponents, with more zeal than reverence, have stigmatized it. The idle taunt, that this is a Jewish, not a Christian canon, the Protestant can easily afford to disregard, when he bears in mind that an inspired apostle has expressly enumerated it amongst the privileges of the Jews, that "to them were committed the oracles of God;" and when he further recollects that two of the greatest Fathers of the Christian Church deemed it no disgrace to Christianity to be indebted for the Old Testament to the Jews. "The Church," says Jerome, "knows nothing of the Apocrypha; recourse must be had to the Hebrew books, from which the Lord speaks, and out of which the disciples take their examples."‡ "The Jews," says Augustine, "carry the volume on which the Christian faith is built; they have been constituted our librarians."† And as to the anathema with which the Fathers of Trent have thought fit to sanction their decree, we console ourselves with the assurance of the inspired sage—"The curse causeless shall not come."

## Correspondence.

### HOW MUCH IS YOUR SOUL WORTH?

TO THE EDITOR OF THE CATHOLIC LAYMAN.

SIR—Jerry Donovan, and myself, and a lot of the neighbours went down to old Ned Bryan's, the other day, to see his boy, who's just come home from California, with a mint of money; for though Ned is a Protestant, still he's a very decent man, and we were all glad to hear of his luck; and while he was telling us all that he seen in his travels, and how the lumps of gold were as thick in the ground as the praties used to be in the old times, who should come in but the minister himself. "God save all here," says he. "God save your reverence," says we. "Well, Ned," says he, "I'm glad to hear that your son has come back to you, and has brought something with him." "Thanks be to God," says Ned, "he has come back safe and sound, and brought enough with him to stock a farm; and I'm telling him that he must be careful not to lose what he has got; for if once he lost it, he'd find it hard to get it back again." "True for you," says the minister; "and," says he, "Ned, that's a hint we should all take; we should all look sharp after the treasure God has given us; for if once it's lost, it's lost for ever." "Why, then, your reverence," says I, "there's some of us that won't have much trouble in looking after our treasure; for," says I, "we haven't ardy to look after." "Deed, then, you have," says he; "poor as you are, you have each a great treasure that's well worth looking after." "What can it be at all?" says the boys; "sure we haven't amongst us what would buy a fat pig." "Still, for all," says the minister, "it's truth I'm telling you, when I say that each one of you, Protestant and Roman Catholic, possesses a treasure that's worth more than all the gold young Ned brought home with him; for," says he, "boys, each one of you has an immortal soul that's worth more than all the gold in California;" and with that, he took down Ned Bryan's big Bible that was on the shelf, and read out for us a verse which said that "it would be no profit to a man if he gained the whole world and lost his soul." Well, the boys began to look at each other, and, says Mick Flynn, "he's going to attack our holy religion out of the Protestant Bible." "And," says Jerry, "that's the Protestant Bible, sir, and sure we don't care for a word that's in it;" and, says another of the boys, "didn't Father John tell us it was the devil's book?" "and," says another, "sure 'twas made by Luther and Henry VIII." "Easy, boys," says the minister, "don't get into a passion; and," says he, "is the Douay Bible the devil's book?" "No," says Mick Flynn, "that's the real sort, that's the genuine article." "And," says the minister again, "was it made by Luther, or Henry VIII.?" "No," says Jerry, "they had no call to it, and we'll believe anything that's in it." "Very good," says the parson, "that's all I want;" and with that, he put his hand into his pocket, and pulled out a real Douay Bible. "Now, boys," says he, "is that your own Bible?" So Jerry, and some of those who were knowledgeable about such things, allowed that it was our own Bible. So the parson handed it to Jerry, and, says he, "find out the Gospel of St. Mark, viii. chap., 36th verse. Well, Jerry looked very foolish, and twisted and turned it, hither and over, but all to no purpose; so he handed it to Mick Flynn, but Mick passed it on to the next, and, at last, it came round to me; but the never a one of us could find out the place. So the parson began to laugh, and, says he, "boys, I think you know as little about your own Bible as about ours." So he found out the place himself, and gave it to Jerry, and, says he, "I'll read first out of the Protestant Bible, and then do you read out of your own Bible." So with that, he read, "For what shall it profit a man, if he shall gain the whole world, and lose his own soul? or what shall a man give in exchange for his soul?" Then Jerry read out of the Douay Bible, "For what shall it

\* S. Antonin. Sum. Hist., part. i. Tit., 3. c. vi. "In totum xxii. pontum Hebraei Libros authenticos. Apocrypha appellunt librum Sapientiam, &c. Ecclesia tamen etiam Apocrypha recipit ut vera, utilia, et moralia, etiam in contentione eorum quae sunt fidei non urgentia ad arguendum."

† Tostatus in enarr. praefat. in Lib. Paralip. q. 7. "Nullus tamen istorum librorum apocryphorum (etiam si sit scriptum inter alios libros Bibl. et legatur in ecclesia), tantae auctoritatis est ut ex eo ecclesia arguat ad probandum aliquam veritatem; et quantum ad hoc non recipit eos. Et de hoc intelligitur quod dicit hic Hieronymus—scilicet Apocrypha nescit ecclesia."

‡ Fr. Ximenes Praef. ad Lect. "At vero libri extra canonem, quos ecclesia potius ad edificationem populi quam ad auctoritatem ecclesiasticorum dogmatum confirmandam recipit, Graecam tantum scripturam habent."

§ Erasmus Epist. ad divin. liter. stud., Tom. iv., oper. Hier. "Magis certe refert, quid quo animo comprobant ecclesia. Ut enim parem tribuat auctoritatem II. breviorum voluminibus et quatuor Evangelis, certe non vult idem esse pondus Judith, Tobiae, et Sapientiae libris, quod Moyses Pentateuchus."

|| Cajetan comment. in 1. cap. Ep. ad Heb. "Hieronymi sortiti sumus regulam, ne erramus in discretionem librorum canonicorum; nam quos ille canonicos tradidit, canonicos habemus; et quos ille a canonicis discrevit extra canonem habemus."

\* Cajetan Ep. dedic. ad P. Clem. VII., ante comm. in Lib. Hist. V. T. "S. Hieronymus, Pater hostiasimo, universa ecclesia Latina plurimum debet, non solum ob annotationes Scripturas, sed etiam propter discretos ab eodem Libros canonicos a non canonicis. Liberat siquidem nos ab Hebraeorum opprobrio, quod fingamus nobis antiqui canonis libros aut librorum partes, quibus ipsi penitus carent."

† Roman Catholic cont. oversial writers, we may observe, usually divide all the books of the Bible into two classes—which they term respectively the *Proto-canonical* and the *Dutero-canonical*. The first class comprises the 22 Jewish books of the Old Testament, and the entire of the New, with the exception of the seven epistles, whose canonical authority was not universally established so soon as that of the rest. The second class embraces the seven apocryphal books and parts of books of the Old Testament, and the as-read seven epistles of the New. By this classification, a twofold advantage is secured—first, by admitting a quasi-distinction between the Apocrypha and the Jewish Scriptures less violence seems to be done to antiquity; and, secondly, by placing the Apocrypha in the same category as the said seven epistles, of whose inspired authority the Church at large never entertained any doubt, an argument is tacitly insinuated for the inspiration of the former.

\* Hieron. Praef. in Paralipom. "Apocrypha nescit ecclesia. Ad Hebraeos revertendum est, unde et Dominus loquitur, ut discipuli exempla praesumant."

† August. in Psalm lvi., § 9. "Codicum portat Judaeus unde credit Christianus. Librarii nostri facti sunt."

*profit a man, if he gain the whole world, and suffer the loss of his soul? or what shall a man give in exchange for his soul?*" "Well, boys," says the minister, "I don't think there's much difference there; and now," says he, "didn't I tell you the truth, when I said that each one of you possessed a treasure that's worth more than all the gold in California?" "True for you," says Jerry, "and 'tis myself that never thought much about the matter; for," says he, "though I knew that I had a soul, still I never thought of how much 'tis worth." "Well," says the minister, "you now see that a man's soul is worth more to him than the whole world; and," says he, "boys, I'll show you another way of finding out the value of the soul;" says he, "if you went into a shop to buy a coat, how would you know the value of it." "By the price I'd have to pay for it," says Jerry. "Just so," says the minister; "and if you knew the price that was paid to save our souls, you'd know the great value of a soul." "Why, then," says Jerry, "there's not a boy in Keelovenogue that knows it better than myself; sure I paid Father John £1 10s. for my father's soul, and £1 5s. for my mother's soul; for he took off five shillings on account of her belonging to the Holy Order of the Scapular; 'tis I that know the price right well, for it set me hard to scrape it together." With that, the minister looked Jerry straight in the face, very sorrowful like, and, says he, "'twas a greater price than that I was thinking of." "Maybe," says I, "your reverence, was thinking of old Jim Crowley, the miser, who made all his money during the famine by robbing the poor starving creatures; his son had to pay £5 for his soul; but sure Father John couldn't do it for less, and it's myself thinks 'twas cheap for such an old villian." With that, the minister turned to me, and, says he, "my poor man, I'm sorry to find you so ignorant; but," says he, "I pity you more than blame you; for," says he, "I can hardly blame a Roman Catholic for the mistake you have made, as long as the priests make such bargains with you; but," says he, "I'll tell you the price that was paid for our souls, 'twas the precious blood of our Lord Jesus Christ; nothing less would pay for our sinful souls, so he laid down his life upon the cross to save those souls; and now, boys," says he, "don't you see the great value of your souls?" "But," says Mick Flynn, "won't every one's soul be saved at that rate?" "No," says the minister; "only those who come to Christ in humble faith, and in the way that he has pointed out, and," says he, "that's the reason I'm showing you the great value of your souls, that you may try whether you are going the right way to have them saved." "Well," says Mick, "I leave it to the priest; for it's his business to see after it." "But," says the minister, "I think it's *your own business*, and you should see to it yourself; and," says he, "when Ned's son made his money in California, I'm sure he didn't trust to any one to look after it for him, but he looked after it himself." "True for your reverence," says young Ned; "'tis a poor account I'd have of it, if I didn't look after it myself; for there's fellows there that would steal the teeth out of your head, if you slept with your mouth open." "Well," says the minister, "bad as the thieves are in California, there's a worse thief here at home, that's looking out for your souls, and that's the devil; and," says he, "boys, he'll surely rob you if he can, and that's the reason I'm telling you to look sharp about your souls." "But," says Jerry, "if we're wrong, 'tis the priests that will be punished for it, and not us; for we only do what they bid us." "Don't trust to that," says the minister, "every man will have to render an account for himself, and it's for that reason I'm urging you to look well after your souls." "At all events," says Jerry, "I'm no worse than others; and if I'm lost there's many will be lost along with me." "I suppose," says the minister, "there's many of you think that a good argument; but," says he, "boys, do you see that red sod of turf in the middle of the fire." "We do your reverence," says we. "Well, now," says he, "is that sod of turf anything cooler for *having a dozen other sods burning around it*?" Well, Mr. Editor, we all looked at each other, and we couldn't but allow that it was nothing cooler, but, on the contrary, hotter. "Well," says the minister to Jerry, "if your poor soul was in hell, would you be any better off for having many others in hell with you? boys," says he, "don't be satisfied with the argument that others are as bad as yourselves; for," says he, "'tis a bad argument, and if you trust to it, you'll find the differ when *too late*." "But," says Jerry, "is it wanting us to quit our holy religion you are? the old, ancient religion that our fathers and grandfathers held before us." "No," says the minister, "I don't want you to give up your religion for my words, all I want of you is to *examine it*; and surely if it's the right religion, the more you examine it the more you'll be convinced of its truth. Some other time," says he, "I may try to show you that your religion is a *new religion*, and not an old one; but," says he, "as I like to take a man on his own ground, even supposing your religion to be the old one, yet, if it be the wrong one, you shouldn't hold to it; and," says he, "do you remember when first the English farmers began to plant turnips for the cattle how you were all against it? and when first the iron ploughs came into fashion many of you declared that you'd rather stick to the old wooden ones that your fathers and grand-

fathers used before you." "That's true," says Ned Bryan; "sure I held out myself against the turnips and iron ploughs until I tried *both ways* of farming, and then I found that the new way was the best." "That's the very thing I'm at," says the minister; "though you were all against the new plans, still, when you *tried both*, you found the new so much better, that you gave up the old. Now," says he, "all I want of you is to *examine both religions*, and don't be content with holding your religion because your father held it before you; for if you act on that principle, you ought to go back to the old wooden ploughs again." "But," says Jerry, "Father John tells us one thing, and your reverence tells us another, and how are we to know which of you is right?" "How did you know which way of farming was best?" says the parson. "We tried both ways," says Jerry. "Very good," says he, "that's just what I want you to do with respect to religion; try what Father John tells you, and what I tell you, by your own Bible, and see which of us sticks closest to that; remember," says he, "all I want of you is to *examine your religion*; I'm not saying whether it is right or wrong, all I say is, *EXAMINE IT*; for," says he, "boys, remember that your souls are of more value than the whole world, and remember that those souls will be lost unless you're going the right way about having them saved, and remember that if your religion be right it will do it no harm to examine it;" and with that he left the house. So when he was gone, all the boys began talking; and, says Jerry, "I'm thinking that's not bad advice the minister gave us; for surely 'twill do our holy religion no harm to examine it." "Take my advice," says I, "and don't examine it at all; for," says I, "every one of the boys that began examining never stopped till they left it." "Why, then," says Ned Bryan, "'tis a bad sign of a religion, if the more you examine it, the less you like it." "True for you," says Jerry, "and I'm determined to get a Douay Bible by hook or crook, and examine for myself." "Jerry," says I, "if once you take to the Bible you'll never stop till you become a jumper." "Why, then," says he, "if our own Bible is against our Church, it's time to jump out of her; but," says he, "I'm sure the Bible is *for us*, if we only examined it; anyhow," says he, "I heard a verse out of it this day that I won't forget to the hour of my death—*What shall it profit a man, if he gain the whole world, and suffer the loss of his soul? or what shall a man give in exchange for his soul?*" I don't know, Mr. Editor, whether Jerry will have the courage to get the Bible; but if he does, I'll let you know.

Your humble servant to command,  
DAN CARTHY.

#### ST. CYRIL ON PURGATORY.

TO THE EDITOR OF THE CATHOLIC LAYMAN.

SIR—I read your admirable paper with great pleasure, and derive much valuable information from the pages of the CATHOLIC LAYMAN; but there is, perhaps, no part of it I admire more than your manner of treating correspondents who write on controversial topics. The tone of Christian courtesy, the entire absence of all low, vulgar abuse, the concise method with which you fairly sum up an opponent's arguments, and the skill and learning displayed in your answers, must surely command the respect of every candid, well-informed man, whether he agrees with you or not.

These remarks I make with reference especially to the controversy going on some time between you and Mr. Power; that gentleman, indeed, deserves the courteous treatment he receives at your hands, for he is no contemptible opponent, and puts forward exceedingly well the very best and strongest arguments that can be urged in favour of his Church, avoiding the rock on which almost all his co-religionists split—unmeaning and unmeasured abuse; such painful vocabulary as men like Drs. Cahill, O'Connell, and Marshall think indispensable, when speaking of those that choose to differ from them.

Mr. Power has, to my mind, found it impossible to prove that the doctrine of purgatory was held by the early Christian Fathers, and I think that you have satisfactorily shown that the practice of praying for the dead did not, of necessity, arise from belief in a purgatorial region. In your last number he has chiefly built his argument on a passage from St. Cyril; but as you have already in a former number explained this passage, I need not say anything respecting it. It is quite evident, that if the Liturgy spoke one language and St. Cyril another, that so long as that Liturgy remained unchanged, the opinion of St. Cyril must be only regarded as the opinion of a private individual, and not that of the Church at large; but though the opinion of St. Cyril has great weight and high authority in this matter with Mr. Power, yet I am sure he would not receive his testimony where that testimony was opposed to the language of the public Liturgy. If we admit that St. Cyril in this instance spoke of purgatory, and that the passage could fairly be adduced as a proof that Cyril believed in the existence of such a place, would any one say that the doctrine was true because such a man held it? I should, for my own part, be very sorry to bind myself to a quarter of the statements made by St. Cyril; and we may see from his solitary example the danger of taking as guides any uninspired man.

What must any rational person think of St. Cyril—what

value can be placed on his testimony—of what worth are his opinions—when he makes such outrageous statements as the following—viz., "That the state of virginity is equal to that of the angels; that when Christ descended into hell the door-keepers of that place, on seeing Jesus, all ran away in terror; that Simon Magus mounted in the air in a fiery chariot, drawn by a pair of dragons; that St. Peter and St. Paul dissolved his enchantments, and he fell to the ground, and broke his bones." And what must we say, but that St. Cyril was a very poor and left-handed friend to Christianity, when he considers that the resurrection is proved by St. Clement's absurd and utterly false account of the phoenix, and that one of the proofs of the truth of the crucifixion is, the fact of the world being full of the chips of the cross!

It is, indeed, high time that those who seek for the truth should look for other teachers than St. Cyril, and not take such a dull and credulous writer as an exponent worthy of the least attention. Many of the men who are styled "Fathers" of the Christian Church, are venerable *only* for their age, but never gave an opinion on Scripture of the slightest value, and were utterly unable to decide a controversy even in their own day; many of them having written things which prove that they were neither wise nor learned in their generation, compel us to ask of their productions the question put by a shrewd observer of human nature—

"Si meliora dies ut vina poemata reddat,  
Scire velim pretium chartis quotus arroget annus?"

Had some of the "Fathers" lived in the time of the apostles, if they occupied any station at all, it would have been in the arrangements of St. Paul, only in giving "judgments of things pertaining to this life;" such being the occupation of those who were "least esteemed in the Church."—1 Cor. vi. 4. How the lapse of centuries could render a foolish or unscriptural opinion of any value or authority, I must confess I never could understand.

Faithfully Yours,  
C. A. M., C. T. R.

In inserting our correspondent's letter, we wish to explain why we have not taken up the line of defence which he suggests. We were quite aware that when the authority of any Father is quoted against us, it would in many cases be easy to show that the writer cited did not possess a sound judgment, and that many of his opinions and interpretations are false, and even ridiculous. We feared, however, that this line of argument would leave the impression on the minds of many of our readers that we were against the Fathers, only because we knew the Fathers to be against us. Now we are persuaded that this is not the case.

We are persuaded that it is just as hard to prove the peculiar doctrines of the Church of Rome out of the early Fathers as it is to prove them out of the Bible. We have, therefore, never shrunk from the appeal to antiquity. When any of our Roman Catholic correspondents can succeed in finding any of the peculiar doctrines of Romanism maintained by any writer of the first three centuries, it will then be time enough for us to enter into the further discussion what the opinion of that writer is worth, and how far we are bound to follow him.

#### AN ENLIGHTENED ROMAN CATHOLIC ARCHBISHOP.

TO THE EDITOR OF THE CATHOLIC LAYMAN.

SIR—The following pastoral letter, addressed during the last year, by the Archbishop of Lucca, to the people of his diocese, in consequence of the re-appearance of the cholera and its dreadful ravages in Italy during last summer, may be acceptable to your readers, first premising a few words concerning the prelate from whom it emanates. Not many years ago he was known in Florence and other Italian cities as "Padre Giulio Arrigoni," of the order of Franciscans, and enjoyed a very high reputation as a popular preacher. Indeed, whenever, during Lent, he delivered a course of sermons either in the "Duomo," at Florence or in the Grand Duke's Chapel, the crowds of people that flocked to hear him (and amongst them hundreds of English and continental Protestants), could hardly be imagined. It was not, however, so much the superiority of his rhetoric, or the purity of his diction (for he spoke with a harsh Lombard accent) as the superiority of his *matter* and the purity of the *doctrine* he propounded from the pulpit, which excited the greatest interest and astonishment, and rivetted the attention of his numerous hearers. Often and often did the writer of these lines go to hear him preach, and often was he in raptures with the beauty and simplicity of the evangelical sentiments abounding in those sermons. Some of them (and even some English clergymen, who formed part of the audience, will bear him out in the statement) could have been preached, *in their integrity*, in any English Protestant Church, and not even the most rigid critic could have impugned their orthodoxy. The names of the Virgin Mary, or of the saints, were scarcely, if ever, mentioned—at least, "*not as intercessors*." The Saviour was pointed out as being all in all—our only example—our only *way*—our only hope. The follies and vices of the people, especially those by which the Italians distinguished themselves from other nations, were severely animadverted upon, and even the *priests themselves* did not escape his censure. If there was any defect in